

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/442,416	12/01/1999	AKIHIRO ICHIGE	2185-0382P	5804
75	590 11/01/2002			
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH LLP			EXAMINER	
P O BOX 747			NAKARANI, DHIRAJLAL S	
FALLS CHUR	CH, VA 22040		WARAKANI, DIIIKAJLAL S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	1773	11
		DATE MAILED: 11/01/2002		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/442,416	ICHIGE ET AL.			
Advisory Action	Examin r	Art Unit			
	D. S. Nakarani	1773			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on the cover sheet with the correspondence address					
THE REPLY FILED 23 October 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.					
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advervent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the status of the shortened by above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moderns.	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the latatutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension fee fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in			
 aarned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>26 June 2002</u>. App 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b					
(a) M they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	pelow);				
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment			
 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ red place the application in condition for allow 6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	rance because: See Continuation	Sheet.			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed: none.					
Claim(s) objected to: none.					
Claim(s) rejected: 1-16.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> .					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·			
10. Other:					
		D. S. Nakarani Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1773			

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The limitation "the inner layer is from 20 to 90% of the thickness of the multilayer film" raises new issue that would require further consideration .

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: At the time of interview it was stated that the instant disclosure is missing some steps to produce exhibited sample and attorney had acknowledged that. Therefore the argument relating to the exhibited sample during interview is not convincing since the instant disclosure does not produce the exhibited sample.

D. S. NAKARANI PRIMARY EXAMINER